

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

The Office Action of August 23, 2007, has been carefully reviewed and these remarks are responsive thereto. Claims 1, 4-17, 20, 27 and 31-33 have been amended. No claims have been canceled or added. No new matter has been added. Claims 1-38 are pending in this application. Reconsideration and allowance of the instant application are respectfully requested.

Allowable Subject Matter

Applicant acknowledges and thanks the Office for the indication of allowable subject matter in claim 19. In view of the present amendments to the claims, Applicant has not rewritten claim 19 in independent form.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1-38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112. Applicant traverses. While Applicant believes that anyone of ordinary skill in the art would readily understand the claims, Applicant has nonetheless amended the claims into a more preferred form, thereby removing the allegedly indefinite language from the claims.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-3, 5-6, 10-11, 13-14, 17, 20, 31, 34, 36, and 38 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2002/0152254). Applicant traverses.

The Office continues to misunderstand the claims with respect to their effect in a workflow process. Specifically, Teng describes a workflow process based on a template, but does not describe how the template is created other than to say that the template may be created using a word processor. On the other hand, aspects of the claimed invention are directed to a process for automatically *creating the template in the first place*, which is then used to drive the workflow process. Stated another way, at most the cited reference and the claimed invention are complementary to each other insofar as Teng picks up where the claims leave off. The claimed invention creates a template for a work flow process, whereas Teng at best only describes a subsequent work flow process *after a template has been created*. Simply put, Teng fails to teach

or suggest any reverse engineering of documents to create a work flow template as claimed. Applicant has made various amendments to the independent claims to clarify this principal difference.

For example, independent claim 1 now recites steps of detecting ... user-selected text portions, analyzing each user-selected text portion to identify at least one corresponding user-selected workflow process parameter, storing each user-selectable text portion with corresponding user-selectable workflow process parameters into a data structure, and executing a computer-based contract negotiation workflow process using the data structure as a *template* to drive the workflow process. Teng does not teach or suggest this claimed method of creating a template to drive a workflow process.

Independent claims 20, 27, 31, and 33 have also been amended to clarify that the claimed methods and systems are used to create a template that drives a workflow process, and are similarly allowable over Teng. Specifically, Teng neither detects user-selected text portions of a displayed contract text document, nor does Teng convert user-selectable text portions [of the contract] and process parameters into a data structure used as a template.

Applicant respectfully requests the rejection be withdrawn.

Claims 4, 7-9, 12, 15-16, 18, 21-30, 32-33, 35, and 37 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Teng in view of Dahlin (U.S. Appl. Publ. No. 2004/0122701). Applicant traverses.

Each claim is allowable at least based on its respective base claim because Dahlin does not cure the deficiencies of Teng.

In addition, with respect to claim 7, neither Teng nor Dahlin teaches or even suggests detecting user-selected *creation of a question* to be asked. At best, Dahlin describes only asking a *pre-existing question*.

Similarly, with respect to claim 8, neither Teng nor Dahlin teach or suggest “detecting *user-selected valid responses* for a question.” Instead, at best, Dahlin describes *pre-existing valid responses* from which a user must choose, but does not describe the user selecting the valid responses in answer to a question.

Claims 27 and 33 and their respective dependent claims are allowable for similar reasons as with respect to claims 1, 20, and 31, discussed in detail above, because Dahlin fails to cure the aforementioned deficiencies of Teng.

CONCLUSION

All rejections having been addressed, applicant respectfully submits that the instant application is in condition for allowance, and respectfully solicits prompt notification of the same. However, if for any reason the Examiner believes the application is not in condition for allowance or there are any questions, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (202) 824-3153.

Respectfully submitted,
BANNER & WITCOFF, LTD.

Dated this 26th day of Oct., 2007

By: /Ross Dannenberg/
Ross Dannenberg, Registration No. 49,024
1100 13th Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20005
Tel: (202) 824-3000
Fax: (202) 824-3001

RAD